

27 December 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]

FROM :

[REDACTED]  
Deputy Director of Personnel  
for Plans and Control

SUBJECT : Restoration of Annual Leave Forfeited in 1973

REFERENCES : (a)

(b)

(c)

1. I am now able to give you a final answer regarding your request for restoration of 14 days and two hours of annual leave that you forfeited in 1973. The Restoration Review Panel has completed the review of the documentation relative to your request and can find no basis for recommending favorable action.

2. The key requisites in consideration of approval by the Chief, European Division of restoration of the annual leave that you forfeited in 1973 were: documentation that such leave had been scheduled in advance, and certification that a declared "exigency" (i.e., not just excessive workload) effecting your work unit must have occurred immediately before, during, or extended into the last three biweekly pay periods of the calendar year which prohibited the scheduling and taking of the leave. According to the documentation available relative to your request in February 1975, the Chief, European Division, who was the appropriate approving Operating Official to make the decision, did not approve the restoration of the annual leave that you forfeited in 1973.

3. The absence of certification and approval by Chief, European Division of your original claim does not provide the Restoration Review Panel with a basis for recommending favorable action to your request.

Distribution:

Orig + 1 - Adse  
1 - D/Pers  
1 - OP/RS

OP/P&C/ [REDACTED] lrm (27 Dec 76)

Approved For Release 2007/12/12 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600060017-5

**Page Denied**

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Denied

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ SECRET ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

## ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)				OGC 76-6 ILLEGIB 12-1-76	
FROM:				DATE	
OL/P&TS 2G10				29 November 1976	
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)		DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	
		RECEIVED		FORWARDED	
1. <del>2B1415 Hqs. Building</del>		11/30		Hubert and Toly,	
2. <del>OGC</del>				As you are aware, [redacted] 20 May 74, established Operating Officials as the approving officials for requests for the restoration of leave forfeited at the end of the 1973 leave year. [redacted] dated 4 Nov 74, stated, however, that such requests had to be submitted via the Director of Personnel to the Director of Finance by 31 Dec 74. Additionally, it established the Restoration Review Panel to review requests beginning with the 1974 leave year.	
3. <del>7D01</del>		12-1-76			
4.					
5. 1212 Key Building					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					

The 1973 requests were submitted to the Director of Personnel to insure that they met the administrative and legal requirements, that is, for the same reasons that the 1974 requests were later to be submitted to the Review Panel. Of course, as the Panel was already established, it reviewed 1973 cases as a sounding board for OP -- but it was OP's responsibility to determine whether or not the request met the criteria for restoration. If the request did not, such fact was made known to the Operating Official concerned.

In the [redacted] case, the Operating Official concerned apparently did not believe the request met the criteria for restoration and denied it in Feb 75. To my knowledge, he never submitted it to OP for an opinion. If he had, having approved the request, I doubt that we would have challenged the case, for

(CONTINUED)

that the exigency must have occurred during, immediately before, or extended into the last 3 bi-weekly pay periods and prohibited the scheduling and taking of leave. Had we received the request in November or December 1974 without the approval of C/EUR I am not certain that the Panel or D/Pers would have recommended otherwise. This being the case, I don't believe we can rule otherwise at this late date. We can only assume that C/EUR understood the criteria for restoration and decided that [redacted] request did not meet that STAT criteria.

STAT